

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claim 1 has been amended. The amendments to claim 1 are supported by at least Figure 30 of the present application. No new matter has been added.

§103 Rejections:

Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams (US 6,099,497) in view of Igaki (US 5,817,100). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Adams discloses with reference to Figure 14D a device 120 that includes a lumen 134, a balloon 124, a secondary lumen 136 and a stent 156. The stent 156 is positioned on the balloon 124 at a position where a proximal end of the stent 156 is positioned distally of a distal end of the secondary lumen 136. As a result, the guidewire 60 exits out the distal end of secondary lumen 136 at a location proximal of the stent 156. No part or portion of the stent 156 is oriented or otherwise disposed about, surrounds or extends around the secondary lumen 136. Adams also fails to disclose or suggest a sheath.

Igaki discloses a stent device that includes a tubular cartridge 1 and a stent 2 fitted on the outer peripheral surface of the cartridge 1. The stent 2 is fixed to the cartridge 1 by, for example, folding back of both ends of the tubular cartridge 1 over ends of the stent 2 (see Figures 4 and 5 of Igaki) or using sleeves 7 fit over ends of the stent 2 (see Figure 7 of Igaki). The stent device disclosed by Igaki is intended to be loaded onto a balloon catheter. The Examiner contends that the cartridge 1 disclosed by Igaki meets the limitations of the sheath required by claim 2. Applicant respectfully disagree.

The combination of the Igaki device with the device 120 of Adams fails to disclose or suggest "the stent is positioned radially outward from and extends around an exterior of at least a portion of the rotatable sheath and at least a portion of the secondary guide wire housing," as required by claim 2. There is no teaching or suggestion by either Adams or Igaki of positioning a stent radially outward from and extending around an exterior of a sheath and a secondary guidewire lumen. Adams only discloses positioning a stent radially outward from and extending around a balloon (see Figure 14D) – not a sleeve or a secondary guide wire housing. Igaki only

discloses positioning of a stent radially outward from and extending around a cartridge 1 and a balloon (see Figure 6-9D)—not a secondary guide wire housing.

Further, Adams and Igaki fail to disclose or suggest "at least a first distal portion of the guidewire housing in contact with at least a first proximal portion of the rotatable sheath," as required by claim 2. The combination of the stent device of Igaki with the device of Adams (e.g., replacing the stent 156 disclosed by Adams with the combination cartridge 1 and stent 2 of Adams) does not result in a structure that meets this limitation of claim 2. There is no disclosure or suggestion by either Adams or Igaki of contacting a distal portion of a guidewire housing with a proximal portion of a sheath. Adams teaches a separation in the axial direction between a secondary lumen 136 and the stent 156 to permit radial extension of the branch guidewire 60 into a branch vessel 16 of the vessel bifurcation. Positioning the Igaki device overlapping the distal end of the secondary lumen 136 would obstruct the distal extension of the guidewire 60, thus rendering the Adams device inoperable for its intended purpose.

Further to the above, neither Adams nor Igaki disclose or suggest "a distal end portion of the secondary guidewire housing exiting the flow path of the stent through one of the plurality of cell openings" of the stent, as required by claim 2. Adams fails to disclose or suggest the secondary housing 136 "exiting the flow path of the stent through one of the plurality of cell openings" of the stent 156. Igaki fails to remedy the deficiencies of Adams. Igaki fails to disclose or suggest that the cartridge 1 and sleeve 2 are structured to permit a lumen to pass therethrough, or that such an outcome is desirable. Therefore, Adams and Igaki fail to disclose or suggest every limitation of claim 2 and the claims that depend from it for this additional reason.

Claims 6, 7 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams in view of Igaki and further in view of Dayton (US 5,449,382). As discussed above, Adams and Igaki fail to disclose or suggest every limitation of claim 2. Dayton fails to remedy the deficiencies of Adams and Igaki as they relate to claim 2. Therefore, claims 6, 7 and 11 are allowable for at least the reason they are dependent upon an allowable base claim. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of this rejection.

Allowed Claims:


Applicants kindly thank the Examiner for the allowance of claims 9, 10, 13 and 14, and the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 8.

In view of the above, Applicants request reconsideration of the application in the form of a Notice of Allowance. If a phone conference would be helpful in resolving any further issues related to this matter, please contact Applicants' attorney at the phone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: August 2, 2006



Joshua N. Randall
Reg. No. 50,719
JNR:ae